

APPENDIX A



Pergamon

Teaching & Teacher Education, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 211-221, 1996
 Copyright © 1996 Elsevier Science Ltd
 Printed in Great Britain. All rights reserved
 0742-051X/96 \$15.00 + 0.00

0742-051X(95)00035-6

ENHANCING MICROTEACHING THROUGH ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK FROM PRESERVICE ADMINISTRATORS

GAYLE A. WILKINSON

University of Missouri—St. Louis, U.S.A.

Abstract—Two university professors integrate their courses to allow students to collaborate with each other in practicing new skills. The preservice administrators provide additional feedback to the preservice teachers on their microteaching while practicing their supervision skills. The data collected over 3 years from the preservice teachers enrolled in their first teaching methods course demonstrate that the preservice teachers were assisted with their transition into teaching. From the feedback they learned about their teaching skills, they found experienced teachers and the process of supervision as valuable to their professional growth, and shifted their perceptions of teaching.

Introduction

Preservice teachers generally hold unrealistic views of teaching. Even after observing teachers for many years as students, they cannot identify the elements of good teaching. The student concentrates on the content being presented by looking through good teaching as though it were transparent. Most certainly, preservice teachers have recognized poor teaching because it actually obstructs their understanding the content being presented. Concept maps developed by preservice teachers and interviews about the lessons they taught to their peers reveal that their knowledge about teaching is idealistic and without theoretical bases. They generally understand the process of teaching but are not aware of classroom dynamics or what students should do (Powell, 1991).

In order to prepare students for teaching we need to assist this perceptual shift from vague idealism by adding enough reality to enable them to survive their induction into teaching. "Reality shock" has been described by Veenman as "the collapse of the missionary ideals formed during teacher training by the harsh and rude reality of classroom life" (Veenman, 1984, p. 143). Many beginning

teachers commence their first teaching assignments with highly idealized perceptions of teaching that they acquired during their 12 plus years of their own schooling (Gordon, 1991). "As pupils, they were accustomed to looking at the classroom from a single perspective—that of a student" (Evans, 1991, p. 158). Preservice teachers value these perceptions because of the personal affection for the memorable teacher even though these teaching practices may not represent good teaching. The students bring these personal, unrealistic, perceptions of teaching to the teacher education program.

As a professor of these preservice teachers, I found that this transition into the reality of teaching often requires overt, deliberate instruction within common elements of preservice teacher education such as field experience and microteaching. I enlisted the collaboration of a professor of preservice administrators to integrate our courses where our curricula shared compatible goals: learning to teach and learning to supervise teachers. The preservice administrators served as microteaching supervisors to the preservice teachers. My study reports the effects of additional feedback during microteaching from this new source:

experienced teachers learning to become administrators. The research questions asked in this study were: How does this additional feedback affect the preservice teachers' perceptions of (a) their teaching abilities, (b) the process of learning to teach, and (c) the value of supervision in professional development? Does this additional feedback enhance the microteaching experience for preservice teachers?

Theoretical Framework

This transition into reality needs a safe introduction to the context of teaching so that preservice teachers begin to develop the concepts that they need to acquire teaching skills. These concepts cannot be generated through a passive explanation by a teacher educator, but must be developed through interacting with the environment of teaching. According to Bolton (1977) humans are active in their learning of contextual information when developing concepts rather than passively observing. This learning process follows the model developed by Kolb and Fry (1976) "which cycles through four phases: a) concrete experience, b) observation and reflection, c) formation of abstract concepts and d) testing concepts in new situations" (p. 33). Experiences in the real context of teaching facilitates the perceptual shift necessary for preservice teachers to make better use of pedagogy than the usual verbal or symbolic explanations found in teacher education (Kapfer & Woodruff, 1972). Through experiences in the context of teaching, students produce their own learning rather than receiving it passively from instructional materials (Denham & Lieberman, 1980).

Microteaching and field experiences have become accepted methods of introducing preservice teachers to the realities of teaching and the roles of teachers. Field experiences provide a real context where the observations made by the preservice teacher focus on the actual teaching behaviors and classroom procedures from the teacher's perspective. This begins the gradual and safe shift in perceptions needed to learn to become a teacher. Microteaching scales down the teaching experience by reducing the numbers of students, the length of the lesson and the complex process of

teaching into manageable parts (Allen, 1966).

Microteaching was created out of the frustration with failure of the traditional teaching methods that only explained the difficulties of teaching but did not effectively connect the theories of teaching with practice. New teachers were tried by the fire of reality without being prepared in the context of reality. Well established as a beneficial element of teacher education, microteaching provides opportunities for novice teachers to develop skills and sensitivity to the complexities of teaching. The traditional process of microteaching, developed at Stanford in 1963 includes: (a) short lessons, (b) pupils who are not peers of the teacher, (c) videotape playback, and (d) a reteach cycle guided by clinical supervisors (Allen & Ryan, 1969).

As microteaching evolved research on the effectiveness of microteaching evolved through four major approaches. Each of these approaches focused on a different type of teacher development. The original approach focused on finite skill acquisition through a repeated cycle of practice, feedback, and reteaching. A second approach focused on modeling desired techniques followed by analysis of performance and rewards for behavior modification. A third approach viewed teaching as a performance of a collection of teaching skills that needed to be learned through selecting the objectives of the micro-lesson, practice, feedback, and correction. The fourth approach emphasized cognitive models where participants' thinking about teaching is emphasized by exposing the inconsistency between the intent and action of teaching revealed by the videotape playback (MacLeod, 1984).

Several reviews of the research done on the effectiveness of microteaching have found conflicting conclusions of the effectiveness of practice, type of supervision, necessity of videotape playback, and endurance of the skill acquisition. Even with all of these questions about effectiveness, many have suggested that microteaching is indeed a valuable method of introducing preservice teachers to the real context of teaching. User satisfaction has been documented in most research reports (MacLeod, 1984). Several surveys that focused on the reteach component of the Stanford microteaching model indicated that most teacher

education programs did not see the value of the reteach session and have eliminated it from the model they use (MacLeod, 1987).

No one knows the entire diversity of microteaching presently being used in teacher education. Even though it has been suggested that the use of microteaching is declining, it most likely exists in such a variety of forms that it is being labeled differently such as "peer teaching" or "small group teaching" (MacLeod, 1987). Microteaching also evolved into the Teaching Techniques Lab (TTL) where paid clinical supervisors assist preservice teachers in planning, teaching, and evaluating short lessons taught to college freshmen paid to participate as pupils (Jerich, 1989). However, most teacher education programs are financially unable to pay clinical supervisors and pupils and must rely on feedback from peers serving as pupils and classroom instructors acting as supervisors. These financial restrictions and time constraints on microteaching most often decrease the quality and amount of feedback given to preservice teachers (Freiberg & Waxman, 1988).

The skill level of preservice teachers differs greatly from their perceptions of their skills. Over-assessing one's performance or abilities seems to be a natural response to challenging situations as a way of protecting one's self-esteem. The fear in self-confrontation via videotape results from seeing actions "different from what they expected and worse than what they hoped for" (Fuller & Manning, 1973, p. 476). Even though the self-confrontation that occurs through the videotape playback of the microteaching lesson can cause stress to the one videotaped, discrepant feedback moves the preservice teacher toward change. The feedback that the preservice teachers receive causes them to view the discrepancy of their actions and what they thought they did or tried to do. As a result most preservice teachers are motivated to improve their teaching skills. Through self-confrontation in microteaching the preservice teacher develops a more realistic perception of the requirements of teaching in a safe environment before they enter into the "field of fire" in the actual classroom (Fuller & Manning, 1973). I think we need to challenge them without overwhelming them.

Microteaching increases the preservice teachers' receptivity to feedback which is necessary for feedback to motivate change in self-perceptions and subsequent behavior. Self-confrontation through feedback improves the accuracy of the preservice teachers' self-perceptions (Braucht, 1970) and the receptivity to additional feedback (Fuller, Menaker, Peck, & Brown, 1967). It seems that the more information that a person has about what is expected, the more likely the person is to change (Fuller & Manning, 1973). Feedback from a variety of sources improves the accuracy of teachers' self-appraisal (Lauroesch, Pereira, & Ryan, 1969), and spending more time in feedback activities increases the realism about self (Smith & Kight, 1959). Feedback containing a specific focus for reflection and evaluation of the performance from a supervisor or instructor increases the benefit of self-confrontation (Fuller & Manning, 1973).

Methods

This study was designed to investigate the impact of additional feedback about microteaching from preservice administrators on the perceptions that preservice teachers hold about teaching. Because the preservice teachers were just beginning their teacher education program, this study was conceptualized on Dewey's definition of reflection: "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it leads" (Dewey, 1933, p. 9); Van Manen's first level of reflection, technical reflection which evaluates the effectiveness of the methods preservice teachers used to implement new theories of teaching (Van Manen, 1977); and the procedure for reflection described by Ross and Regan (1993) as "an individual process containing two elements: metacognitions (awareness of the strategies, theories, and feelings that underlie one's professional problem solving) and appraisals (judgments about performance)" (p. 92).

This project concentrated primarily on perceptual changes instead of changes in behavior and perceptions of growth rather than

measurable changes (Richardson, 1990). The treatment attempted to facilitate the shift in preservice teachers' perceptions about teaching through additional feedback from experienced teachers. Traditionally, the sections of the initial course in general methods are limited to 20 students to facilitate the instructors acting as the supervisors who provide feedback on the microteaching experiences. The students in all sections of the course received the same instruction on reflection, opportunity for field observation and the same number of microteaching experiences. Only the preservice teachers in the experimental group received additional feedback from the group of experienced teachers enrolled in a concurrent administration course.

Subjects

The preservice teachers attended an urban, midwestern university and were heterogeneous in ability, age, experience, socioeconomic background, and ethnicity. Each semester one or two sections were selected for the experimental group and one or two sections were identified as the control group. Students in these designated sections over the course of three years became a part of either the experimental group ($n = 104$) or the control group ($n = 98$). The author and two other professors taught the experimental sections. The other two professors also taught sections of the control group. All sections used the same curriculum. Over the same 3 years the experienced teachers, who provided the additional feedback, were enrolled in a semester-long graduate course on supervision where the primary objective was to prepare them to become proficient in observing and evaluating teachers.

Treatment

Only the preservice teachers in the experimental group received additional feedback from the preservice administrators. The exchange of feedback occurred only once during the semester, because of the time required for both groups to learn basic skills in teaching or supervising. Within small groups the preservice administrators viewed the videotaped lessons of a small group of preservice teachers. Each preservice administrator was

responsible for providing concise and specific feedback to one of the preservice teachers in the small group about his or her teaching in a formal, written observation report. After reading the reports each preservice teacher provided written responses to the preservice administrator by answering open-ended questions about the feedback on his or her lesson found in the observation reports. Written feedback was used because face-to-face conversation was difficult to arrange due to the variety of class meeting times and the potential discomfort that the preservice teachers may have felt at being evaluated on their first formal attempt at teaching a lesson plan using a specific teaching model.

Preparing Both Groups of Preservice Teachers for Microteaching

Most of the preservice teachers had taught in informal settings, but had not formalized their instruction into plans that follow models to reach specific objectives. Many of them had not yet developed confidence in being before a group of students and being responsible for teaching specific concepts. Before microteaching the preservice teachers in both experimental and control groups were taught the basic principles of reflection, planning instruction, and following teaching models. Early in the course they studied reflection-on-action by reading about the process of reflection (Posner, 1993), discussing the value of reflection, and writing reflectively about class activities. They learned about writing objectives, content selection, and lesson planning before learning specific models of teaching.

The first teaching model that the preservice teachers in both the experimental and control groups learned was the direct instruction model which was demonstrated by the instructors, discussed in classes, and observed in the schools during their field experiences. Using this model each preservice teacher wrote and taught a micro-lesson to a small group of their classmates in a teaching lab equipped with videotape recorders. In both the experimental and control groups each preservice teacher and the classmates acting as pupils evaluated each lesson by viewing the videotape, recording personal observations, and sharing these obser-

versations with each other through discussion and written comments.

In both groups the classmates used a rating scale checklist of simple teacher behaviors including: maintaining eye contact, expressing clear objectives, and presenting their lessons in a logical sequence rather than asking them to evaluate specific sections of the direct instruction model. In order to practice simple reflection on their first micro-lesson the preservice teachers were asked to watch the playback of their lesson, review the peer observations, and answer simple questions about their lesson such as: "What are the strengths of the lesson you taught?", "What would you do differently if you taught this lesson again?" The preservice teachers in the experimental group gave their videotapes, the microteaching lesson plan, self-evaluation, and peer evaluations to the preservice administrators.

Preparing Preservice Administrators for Providing Feedback

The primary objective of the supervision course for preservice administrators was to prepare them to become proficient in observing and evaluating teachers. One of the most important technical skills of supervision is the ability to assess the match between the lesson planned and the actual lesson delivered by the teacher. Throughout the semester the preservice administrators surveyed models of supervision and supervision instruments, learned the theories of supervision, and studied the interpersonal and technical supervision skills necessary for effective supervision.

Using the direct instruction model as a framework, the preservice administrators developed the observation instrument from the evaluation instrument used to assess the student teachers in our teacher education program. While viewing each preservice teacher's lesson, the preservice administrators recorded on a checklist the teaching behaviors they observed without evaluating the proficiency of each behavior on a rating scale. The skills areas included in the observation instrument were: (a) demonstrates preparation for classroom instruction, (b) implements effective teaching techniques, (c) provides for individual differences, (d) implements instructional objectives,

(e) demonstrates knowledge of subject matter, (f) uses a variety of teaching materials, (g) uses instructional time effectively, (h) demonstrates ability to motivate students, (i) demonstrates ability to communicate effectively with students, and (j) provides students with specific, evaluative feedback.

After viewing the video tapes and discussing the observations within small groups, each preservice administrator prepared a formal observation report for one preservice teacher. In the reports the preservice administrators provided specific feedback about what was done well, what should be considered for change, and what could be done to improve the lesson. Each observation report also included personal messages to the preservice teachers encouraging them to continue their development and welcoming them to the teaching profession. The observation reports containing the specific feedback, the video tapes, lesson plans, self-evaluation, and peer comments were returned to the preservice teachers.

Teachers Respond to the Feedback

After reading the observation reports, reflecting on the videotaped lesson and the comments made about it, each preservice teacher completed an open-ended questionnaire about the additional feedback received from the preservice administrators. The questions included: "How did the specific comments about your teaching help you understand your own teaching practices?", "Describe the most beneficial aspects of the evaluation", "Describe your attitude toward evaluation as a result of this evaluation." These questions and the responses of the preservice teachers were given to the preservice administrators as feedback on their observation reports.

Data Collection

Over 3 years the data for this study were collected from the responses of the preservice teachers to the additional feedback given to them on their microteaching, and were analyzed using combinations of three different sets of questions. The questions developed over the 3 years in response to the data analysis results each year.

Instrumentation

The first questionnaire contained open-ended questions about the feedback that the preservice teachers received about their microlessons from the preservice administrators. Sample questions from this first questionnaire include: "Describe the most beneficial aspects of the evaluation" and "What have you learned from this experience that will help you the most?" The analysis of the collected responses was used to develop 10 closed questions using a Likert scale that sought to measure the change in perceptions of learning to teach. These three perceptual areas were assessed by the questionnaire: (a) perceptions of their teaching ability, (b) perceptions of the importance of developing skills in teaching, and (c) perceptions of the value of professional development. (A copy of the questionnaire is in the Appendix.) The reliability of this questionnaire was calculated to be .64 using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. The reliability of the questionnaire prompted the researcher to revise the 10 closed questions to 5 open-ended questions that could be given to both experimental and control groups. These revised, open-ended questions included more general questions such as: "How beneficial were the microteaching episodes in learning to teach using a lesson plan?"

Procedure

In the first and second year those in the experimental group answered the original open-ended questionnaire after reading the observation report by the preservice administrators during the last week of the semester. The questionnaire using a Likert scale was administered in the second and third years as a pretest in the second week of the course and posttest during the last week of the semester to

the control and the experimental groups. At the same time the original open questionnaire was also given to the experimental groups. The revised open-ended questionnaire was administered in the third year to both the control and experimental groups during the last week of the semester. The instruments and processes used to collect the data are shown in Table 1.

Data Analysis, Results, and Discussion

The analysis of the data and the results will be discussed in three sections: (a) themes found in the responses to the 10 open-ended questions (years 1 and 2), (b) a comparison of responses by the control and experimental groups on the pre- and posttest questionnaires (years 2 and 3), and (c) percentages of the responses by the control and experimental groups on the questionnaires using the five revised, open-ended questions (year 3).

Section 1: Responses to Original Open-Ended Questions

The responses to the open-ended questions of the preservice teachers in the experimental group ($n = 90$) for years 1 and 2 were analyzed by tabulating the frequency of responses. The responses clustered into three major themes: (a) feedback helped in learning to teach, (b) comments from experienced teachers helped them realize their skills in teaching, and (c) being supervised is important in learning to teach.

The first theme is evident in the preservice teachers' report that the specific feedback was beneficial to them in learning to teach. The feedback helped them in the following ways:

a) The observation report identified areas where teachers needed to make improvements in their lessons.

Table 1

<i>Data Collection Process</i>			
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Experimental	10 open questions	10 open questions	5 open questions
Control	none	pretest posttest pretest posttest	pretest posttest 5 open questions pretest posttest

b) The preservice administrators suggested specific things that could be done to improve the lessons.

c) This feedback confirmed what the teachers had done well.

The following comments from the preservice teachers were common examples that supported this theme: "[The specific comments] caused me to reflect on my performance and make attempts to improve." "I think being observed as a teacher is essential. It allows me to get feedback on what and how I am teaching. This can only increase my teaching abilities."

The second theme demonstrated that the preservice teachers believed that learning from other teachers was valuable because they realized the level of their skill development. The feedback from the preservice administrators affected them in the following ways:

a) They reported that the positive comments encouraged them to continue to learn more about teaching.

b) Comments from the preservice administrators confirmed or were more positive than the teacher's self-evaluations.

c) By learning what they did correctly, they felt more confidence in their teaching abilities.

Realization of their teaching skill level is evident in these comments: "The narrative description was very beneficial. Sometimes when a person reviews him or herself, they remember things incorrectly or blow things out of proportion." "It was better than my own evaluation and much more detailed. The specifics about what I did well were very helpful for me."

The third theme shows that the preservice teachers valued supervision for their own professional development. What they learned about supervision included:

a) They realized that constructive comments could identify skills that needed to be developed.

b) They thought the evaluations told the truth about the teaching practice by confirming, adjusting, and negating some of their perceptions of their teaching.

c) They felt that evaluations that provide constructive criticism that is helpful in learning to teach and should not be feared or avoided.

The preservice teachers' comments displayed

their new understanding of the value of supervision for professional development: "I see that professional development is the teamwork of learning together. I see it as a way to improve instead of a way to discriminate against new teachers." "Having another person view your lesson can give you valuable insight into changes, modifications, and enhancements that need to be made to your lesson."

The preservice teachers used the written observation report to review their lesson plans, peer and self-evaluations, and to reflect on their own teaching. Most of them were surprised to find so many positive comments on their first lesson and enjoyed reading the suggestions for improving that lesson. Because of their limited teaching experience, their reflection most often was limited to what they had done right or wrong and stopped short of concrete ideas for improving the lesson. They found this additional feedback helpful because they learned how to improve their lessons from the suggestions that were provided.

Section 2: Responses to Pretest and Posttest Questionnaires

In the second and third years the preservice teachers in the experimental groups ($n = 104$) and the control groups ($n = 98$) completed pretest and posttest questionnaires. Within group comparisons using the *t*-test showed no variability due to different instructors within both the control and experimental groups. (The number of completed paired pre- and posttests is less than expected because some subjects did not complete either the pretest or posttest.) The data were analyzed using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) comparing the means of the posttest scores controlling for possible differences in the pretest scores. The results of the ANCOVA ($F = 39.88$, $P < .0001$) showed significant differences between the control and experimental groups in their perceptions of learning to teach from the pretest to the posttest. Even though we would expect a lower reliability on an instrument with only 10 questions to assess the differences, caution should be used in drawing permanent conclusions from the data.

The preservice teachers who received detailed feedback about their microlessons from the

preservice administrators seemed to have different perceptions of teaching. They appeared to understand their own teaching skills better than teachers in the control group. Perhaps the specific comments about the lesson suggested improvements for the lesson and the positive comments about the lesson gave the preservice teachers in the experimental group more insight about their own teaching abilities than the control gained through the traditional feedback on their microteaching. Those in the experimental group appeared to place more importance on learning teaching skills than those in the control group. The checklist of teaching behaviors supplied by the preservice administrators on the observation report could have exposed the reality of the teaching skills demonstrated by the preservice teachers. The experimental group reported placing greater value on supervision for their own professional development. Through this experience the preservice teachers recognized the importance of supervision in learning how to teach. The results of the ANCOVA verify the themes found in the responses to the open-ended questions and reported in Section 1: (a) the specific feedback helped them learn to teach, (b) the comments from the administrators gave them specific ways to improve their lessons, and (c) supervision is valued for their professional development.

Responses to Revised Open-Ended Questions

During the third year of the project both experimental and control groups were asked to respond to five revised, open-ended questions about learning to teach. The similar responses to each question were grouped and counted for both groups. The frequencies of the responses were tabulated and converted to frequency by percentage so that comparisons between groups could be made. The frequencies of the responses by both groups are shown in Table 2.

Fifty-six percent of the preservice teachers receiving the specific feedback from the preservice administrators reported knowing their teaching strengths and weaknesses better at the end of the semester compared to 44% of those not receiving the feedback. Twenty-four percent of the control group said that

they did not know their teaching strengths and weaknesses very well compared to 15% of the experimental group. Seventy-seven percent of the experimental group compared to 51% of the control group found the microteaching experience very beneficial. Only 8% of the experimental group compared to 40% of the control group reported that their perceptions of teaching had not changed during the semester. The perceptions that were reported as changing were the preparation requirements and the reality of teacher-student interactions. Microteaching was the most valuable part of the course for about the same number of preservice teachers in each of the groups. But the experimental group named their observations in the field experience as most valuable more often than the control group. Forty-seven percent of the experimental group named the field experience as the most important part of the course. One-third of the control group reported that their view of professional development had not changed or did not respond to the question compared to 13% of the experimental group. One-third of the experimental group compared to 16% of the control group claimed that their view of professional development had changed because they now realized the importance of planning and preparation.

The themes identified in Section 1 and the results of the ANCOVA also are evident in the results of the responses to the open-ended questions given to both the experimental and control groups. The experimental group more often reported knowing their teaching strengths and weaknesses, found the microteaching experience very beneficial, changed their own perceptions of teaching during the semester, and viewed professional development as an important element in learning to teach.

Conclusions

This microteaching process followed the four phases of the Kolb and Fry (1976) model of learning: (a) practice teaching experience, (b) observing and reflecting on their teaching, (c) forming new concepts of teaching, and (d) verifying their concepts in a

Enhancing Microteaching

219

Table 2

Teacher Response Content Analysis—1994

Open questions	Responses by per cent	Control	Experimental
1. How well do you know your teaching strengths and weaknesses?	<i>N</i> =	55	39
a. Not very well		24%	15%
b. Much better		44%	56%
c. Fairly well		33%	15%
d. I already knew them before		2%	8%
e. No response		0	5%
2. How beneficial were the microteaching episodes in learning to teach using a lesson plan?	<i>N</i> =	55	39
a. Very beneficial because...		51%	77%
b. Somewhat beneficial		36%	21%
c. Not beneficial		13%	2%
3. How have your perceptions of teaching changed during this semester?	<i>N</i> =	55	39
a. My perceptions didn't change.		40%	8%
b. It requires more preparation than I thought		18%	28%
c. Realized new reality in the teacher-student interaction		18%	38%
d. Learned many new teaching techniques		3%	15%
e. More confident in my teaching		7%	3%
f. How important is the lesson plan		5%	0
g. Found greater support for new teachers		5%	0
h. More excited about teaching		3%	2%
i. No response		2%	5%
4. What were the most valuable aspects of this course?	<i>N</i> =	70	49
a. Observing real classes (field experience)		28%	47%
b. Microteaching		37%	35%
c. Learning teaching techniques		16%	6%
d. Learning the reality of teaching		10%	0
e. Everything		3%	2%
f. Class discussions		0	10%
g. No response		1%	0
h. Instructor		3%	0
i. Text		1%	0
5. How has the mini-teaching experience affected your view of professional development?	<i>N</i> =	55	39
a. Demonstrated the importance of planning and preparation		16%	33%
b. Helped prepare me for teaching		11%	13%
c. Showed that professional development is important		18%	21%
d. Showed that professional development is not important		4%	0
e. Showed the process of developing skills in teaching		16%	15%
f. View was not affected		13%	5%
g. No response		20%	8%
h. More confident in teaching		2%	5%

new situation. The preservice teachers felt that the feedback from the preservice administrators helped them shift their perceptions of their teaching abilities and skills. Because it is normal to hold negative views of one's own teaching as residue from the self-confrontation via the videotape playback, the preservice teachers described the specific feedback in the observation report as helpful for sorting out their teaching strengths and weaknesses and providing encouragement. Through this experience they related that supervision by

experienced teachers was valuable to their professional growth and development.

Even though both the experimental group and the control group experienced the same classroom curriculum, similar field experiences and equivalent microteaching processes, the experimental group showed a greater difference in their perceptions of teaching. They reported being more aware of their teaching strengths and weaknesses than the control group. Their responses indicate that they placed greater importance of learning teaching skills and

greater value on the process of professional development. The additional feedback gave them more information which could have caused the greater perceptual shift toward the realities of teaching.

The responses of the two groups to the five revised open-ended questions also showed the differences between the control and experimental groups. The experimental group reported knowing their own teaching strengths and weaknesses better than the control group. The preservice teachers who received feedback from the preservice administrators also reported that the microteaching episodes were more beneficial than the control group. The experimental group related greater difference in their perceptions about the realities of learning to teach. The responses to the question about professional development reinforced the data from the open-ended questions reported previously. The experimental group reported a greater shift in their perceptions of the value of professional development in learning to teach than the control group.

As a result of this study I believe that preservice teachers can begin their perceptual shift about teaching through learning the realities of teaching through experience, utilizing feedback from experienced teachers, and valuing professional development at the beginning of teacher education. The university instruction was enhanced because the preservice teachers received additional specific feedback that provided information that they could use to understand the realities of teaching and learning to teach.

Implications

Professional preparation programs should consider enhancing microteaching through using experienced teachers studying supervision to provide additional information in programs that lack feedback from actual pupils and paid supervisors. Other possibilities exist for enhancing preservice teacher education without the expense or complication of collaborative programs with public schools. A rich opportunity for teaching the benefits of cooperative practice lies within our own schools of education and imagination.

References

- Allen, D. W. (1966). *Microteaching: A description*. Los Angeles, CA: Stanford University.
- Allen, D. W., & Ryan, K. A. (1969). *Microteaching*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Braucht, G. N. (1970). Immediate effects of self-confrontation on the self-concept. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 35(1), 95-101.
- Bolton, N. (1977). *Concept formation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Denham, C., & Lieberman, A. (May, 1980). *Time to learn*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and National Institute of Education.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Boston, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Evans, H. L. (1991). A framework for designing field experiences: A Jamaican study. In L. G. Katz & J. D. Rath (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (Vol. 4, pp. 155-172). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Freiberg, H. J., & Waxman, H. C. (1988). Alternative feedback approaches for improving student teachers' classroom instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(4), 8-14.
- Fuller, F. F., Menaker, S. L., Peck, R. F., & Bown, O. H. (1967). Influence of counseling and film feedback on openness to pupil feedback in elementary teachers' filmed behavior. *Proceedings of the 75th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*, 2, 359-360.
- Fuller, F. F., & Manning, B. A. (1973). Self-confrontation reviewed: A conceptualization for video playback in teacher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 43(4), 469-528.
- Gordon, S. P. (1991). *How to help beginning teachers succeed*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jerich, K. (1989). Using a clinical supervision model for micro-teaching experiences. *Action in Teacher Education*, 11(3), 24-32.
- Kapfer, P. G., & Woodruff, A. D. (1972, Sept). The life involvement model of curriculum and instruction. *Educational Technology*, 64-72.
- Kolb, D. A., & Fry, R. (1976). Towards an applied theory of experimental learning. In G. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of group processes* (pp. 33-57). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lauroesch, W. P., Pereira, P. D., & Ryan, K. A. (1969). *The use of student feedback in teacher training*. Final Report, Project No. 8-E-115. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 035 588)
- MacLeod, G. R. (1984). Microteaching effectiveness. In T. Husen & T. N. Posthethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- MacLeod, G. R. (1987). Microteaching: end of a research era? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11, 531-541.
- Posner, G. J. (1993). *Field experience: A guide to reflective teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman Publishing Group.
- Powell, R. R. (1991). Acquisition and use of pedagogical

- knowledge among career-change preservice teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 13(4), 17-23.
- Richardson, V. (1990). Significant and worthwhile change in teaching practice. *Educational Researcher*, 19(7), 10-18.
- Ross, J. A., & Regan, E. M. (1993). Sharing professional experience: Its impact on professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 91-106.
- Smith, E. E., & Kight, S. S. (1959). Effects of feedback on insight and problem solving efficiency in training groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 43(3), 209-211.
- Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6(3), 205-228.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143-178.

APPENDIX

Preservice Teacher Questionnaire

Class section

Birthdate

Please indicate your honest judgment of the following questions by circling the number of the most appropriate response.

1. How well do you know your specific teaching strengths and weaknesses?
Not well 1 2 3 4 5 Very well
2. How important is a well-developed lesson plan for successful teaching?
Not 1 2 3 4 5 Very important
3. How important is it for teachers to review the effectiveness of their lesson plans?
Not 1 2 3 4 5 Very important
4. How important is the clarity of the lesson objective to the success of the lesson?
Not 1 2 3 4 5 Very important
5. How well do you think you can teach?
Not well 1 2 3 4 5 Very Well
6. How confident are you about your abilities to learn to teach well?
Not 1 2 3 4 5 Very confident
7. How valuable are evaluations of your teaching by your peers?
Not 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable
8. How valuable would it be for you to evaluate your lesson by watching a video tape of your teaching?
Not 1 2 3 4 5 Very valuable
9. How helpful are evaluations of teachers by a principal for developing teaching skills?
Not 1 2 3 4 5 Very helpful
10. How helpful would it be to have an experienced teacher watch your video tape and give you suggestions for improving your lesson?
Not 1 2 3 4 5 Very helpful

Submitted 16 September 1993

Accepted 14 July 1995